



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09 750,425	12 28 2000	Thomas J. Grimsley	XNT-092	7861

959 7590 01 29 2003

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD  
28 STATE STREET  
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TU T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2877

DATE MAILED: 01/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.	09/750,425	Applicant(s)	GRIMSLY, THOMAS J.
Examiner	Tu T Nguyen	Art Unit	2877

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
  - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Detailed Office Action

*Specification*

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- 1) In the specification, page 5, line 16, the "Figures 2A-G" should be corrected to "Figure 2A-E".
- 2) In the specification, page 8, line 19; page 9, line 7; the "topography 20" is not in fig. 3A.
- 3) In the specification, page 8, line 1, the "photosensor 14" is not in fig 3A.

*Claim Objections*

Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 6, line 1, "the second filter" lacks antecedent basis.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 11, lines 4-5, the phrase "non-sensor area of the wafer for applying a second filter layer" is not clear. It is not clear what applicant means.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321<sup>©</sup> may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-14 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,198,093. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-6 of '093 discloses all the limitations of claims 1-14 in the application.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant admitted prior art (fig 1, figs 2A-2E) or Applicant specification pages 1-3) (AAPA hereinafter).

With respect to claims 1,9,11,13, AAPA discloses a method of fabricating an electro-optical device. The method comprises: imbedding a sensor in a substrate 14a-c (fig 2A) and non-sensor area 20 (fig 2A), applying a first layer 24 (fig 2B) on at least a portion of the non-sensor area, applying the second filter layer 26 (fig 2D).

AAPA does not explicitly disclose applying the first filter layer to at least partially planarize the device. However, figure 2A discloses applying the first filter layer all over the surface of the device and in the specification, page 2, lines 21-24, AAPA discloses using a spinning method for spreading the filter layer on the surface of the device. It would have been obvious that by using the spinning method, the filter layer at least partially planarize the device.

With respect to claims 2-3,10,12,14, AAPA discloses applying a translucent base layer

22 (fig 2A or specification page 6, line 14).

With respect to claim 4, since AAPA's sensor is for sensing images, AAPA inherently discloses mounting the electro-optical device in an image forming system.

With respect to claim 5, AAPA does not explicitly disclose a pigment. However, filter layer contains a pigment would have been known. It would have been obvious to modify AAPA with the known layer containing a pigment to make the sensor more efficient.

With respect to claim 6, AAPA discloses applying a second filter 26 (fig 2D). Further refer to discussion in claim 1 above for planarizing the device.

With respect to claim 7, AAPA does not disclose a third layer filter. However, it would have been obvious to modify AAPA with a plurality filters for detecting a plurality primary colors. The modification involve only routine skill in the art.

With respect to claim 8, it would have been obvious that each filter layer in AAPA corresponding the a primary color.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tu T Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-9185. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 7:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Frank G Font can be reached on (703) 308-4881. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9318 for regular communications and (703) 872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



**Tu Tuan Nguyen**

**Patent Examiner TC 2877**  
**1/24/03**